

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Sayadian for the courtesies extended at the recent interview, which has been much appreciated. Applicant's herewith confirm the substance of the interview as set forth on the Examiner's Summary form. As a result of the discussions noted, Applicant amends the claim set to improve form and format, and substantively amends several of the claims as will be discussed below.

Claims 1-36 are all the claims pending in the application, of which claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 17 - 22 and 25 - 32 are presently withdrawn from consideration.

As this Amendment supplements the prior Amendment of October 19, 2006, Applicant requests that the two amendments and their attendant remarks be considered cumulatively. Applicants therefore limit the comments in these remarks to additional points beyond those made in the prior response.

Turning first to claim 2, this claim has been amended to indicate that the down-counter reduces the repetition rate of the system. Other limitations in claim 2 place the down-counter of the invention before the power amplifier.

Richardson discloses a plurality of AOM devices, independently operating before and between his amplifiers. It is not disclosed that any one of these AOMs reduces the repetition rate *for the system*. Applicants achieve the important ability to use just one down-counter in the amplification system by operating the pre-amplifiers so that they are saturated by the repetition rate; thus preventing ASE build-up. Nothing of this sort is suggested by Richardson, and it is

certainly not disclosed or suggested that all but one of the prior art AOMs may be dispensed with..

Richardson further does not control spectrum as claimed by Applicants, by way of a spectral filter positioned after the oscillator or the following stretcher. Further, as specified by dependent claim 9, and now in independent claim 16, the AOM of the invention can be configured to act as a spectral filter, thus serving in a dual role, which is clearly not disclosed or suggested by the prior art.¹

Claim 4 has been further amended, highlighting the modularity aspect of the invention by tying this feature to the provision of tap units within or between the modules, for the particular purpose of spectral measurement following narrowing of the oscillator spectrum. As previously noted, the prior art does not disclose either taps or spectrum monitoring or control, nor the attendant advantages on compressibility.

Claim 15 has been amended as well to focus in further on the spectral monitoring features of the invention, and particularly with respect to the function of identification of incompressible pulse components by the ability to tap between modules. As previously noted, the prior art does not address spectral quality, monitoring or measuring, in any significant way.

Claims 23 and 24 have each been amended similarly to highlight similar spectral quality features. With respect to claim 24 in particular, the combined isolator/spectral filter is considered especially advantageous and is notably absent from the cited art.

¹ Contrary to the Examiner's comments in the Office Action, the "diffractive nature" of an AOM does not imply spectral filtering, and thus the function is not inherent.

Claim 33 was addressed in some detail in the prior response, but it is worth noting again that the AOM claimed here is performing a quite different function than found in the noted art. Here, the AOM acts as a pulse deflector and, as specifically claimed in claim 34, actually serves as one stage of the compressor. The bulk grating is adjacent and helps correct the spatial dispersion of the AOM. While the prior art discloses plural AOMs, they do not perform as claimed, are not positioned following the power amplifiers, and especially do not serve as one stage of the compressor. Moreover, in the prior art, spatial dispersion of the AOM is corrected in the traditional fashion, e.g., by a following lens. As already noted, the prior art discloses only that the compressor performs temporal, not spatial, dispersion correction, in the completely traditional manner for such CPA systems, and indeed, in view of the lenses following the AOMs, there would be no spatial dispersion to correct at the compressor location, following the prior art teachings.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Supplemental Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
USSN 10/813,163

A8698

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 3, 2007

/Richard Turner/
Richard C. Turner
Registration No. 29,710